UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,512	08/29/2001	Stuart T. Stanton	3731-0177P	5220

30595 7590 11/05/2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER	
DAY, HERNG DER	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/940,512	STANTON, STUART T.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Herng-der Day	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 January 2002* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined and claims 1-16 have been rejected.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. The provisional application number is 60/270,872, filed February 26, 2001.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to for the following reasons. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3-1. As described in paragraph [0056] at page 21, "Note that in Figure 5b, the starting assumption is model #6, but the truth model is model #4, both of which lie inside a range from a low at #1 to a high at #9". However, as shown in FIG. 5(b), the range is from a low at #2 to a high at #1".

3-2. Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Appropriate correction is required.

4-1. It appears that "HT(k+1)", as shown in equation 3) of paragraph [0029] at page 9 should be "$H^T(k+1)$".

Claim Objection

5. Claim 16 is objected to for being identical to claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanton et al., "Initial Wafer Heating Analysis for a SCALPEL Lithography System", Microelectronic Engineering, Volume 46, Issues 1-4, May 1999, pages 235-238.

7-1. Regarding claim 1, Stanton et al. disclose a projection electron lithography system, comprising:

a lithography tool for emitting a beam of electrons (SCALPEL tool, section 1, first paragraph, page 235) and producing measurement information (Alignment Sensor, Figure 5, page 238); and

a processor including, at least one model for producing predictive information (Model: (pattern + operating state), Figure 5, page 238), and

an estimator for controlling placement of the beam of electrons based on the predictive information from said at least one model and measurement information from said lithography tool (Measurement Update: Compute Kalman gain, measure to update position & error estimates, Figure 5, page 238).

7-2. Regarding claim 2, Stanton et al. further disclose said estimator compensates for heating and beam drift effects (expansion-induced pattern placement errors will require a sub-field position correction strategy, abstract, page 235).

7-3. Regarding claim 3, Stanton et al. further disclose said estimator is a Kalman filter, using least-squares based linear matrix algebra (Kalman filter methodology, Figure 5, page 238).

7-4. Regarding claim 4, Stanton et al. further disclose said system is a SCALPEL system (SCALPEL tool, section 1, first paragraph, page 235).

7-5. Regarding claim 9, Stanton et al. disclose a process for controlling projection electron lithography, comprising:

emitting a beam of electrons (Electron-beam Lithography, section 1, first paragraph, page 235);

producing measurement information on said emitting step (Alignment Sensor, Figure 5, page 238);

producing predictive information related to the projection electron lithography process (Model: (pattern + operating state), Figure 5, page 238), and

controlling placement of the beam of electrons based on the predictive information and the measurement information (Measurement Update: Compute Kalman gain, measure to update position & error estimates, Figure 5, page 238).

7-6. Regarding claim 10, Stanton et al. further disclose said controlling step is implemented as a Kalman filter using least-squares based linear matrix algebra (Kalman filter methodology, Figure 5, page 238).

7-7. Regarding claim 11, Stanton et al. further disclose said controlling step compensates for heating and beam drift effects (expansion-induced pattern placement errors will require a sub-field position correction strategy, abstract, page 235).

7-8. Regarding claim 12, Stanton et al. further disclose said process is a SCALPEL process (SCALPEL tool, section 1, first paragraph, page 235).

8. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiraishi, U.S. Patent 6,243,158 issued June 5, 2001, and filed August 4, 1997.

8-1. Regarding claim 1, Shiraishi discloses a projection electron lithography system, comprising:

a lithography tool for emitting a beam of electrons (projection exposure apparatus, FIG. 1) and producing measurement information (measuring a baseline data, column 3, lines 33-37); and

a processor including, at least one model for producing predictive information (at least one baseline data measured previously, column 3, lines 37-41), and

an estimator for controlling placement of the beam of electrons based on the predictive information from said at least one model and measurement information from said lithography tool (aligning the projected image, column 3, lines 37-45).

8-2. Regarding claim 2, Shiraishi further discloses said estimator compensates for heating and beam drift effects (the effects of this change can be minimized, column 7, lines 55-64).

8-3. Regarding claim 3, Shiraishi further discloses said estimator is a Kalman filter, using least-squares based linear matrix algebra (Kalman filter, column 8, lines 4-11).

8-4. Regarding claim 5, Shiraishi further discloses said at least one model includes a plurality of different models and said Kalman filter is an adaptive Kalman filter, wherein said adaptive Kalman filter iteratively selects one of the plurality of different models until a best one of plurality of different models emerges (one, two, or more of the previously measured baseline measurement values, column 7, lines 28-40).

8-5. Regarding claim 6, Shiraishi further discloses said at least one model includes a plurality of different models and said Kalman filter is an adaptive Kalman filter, said adaptive Kalman filter having a tunable strength parameter to determine an optimal adaptation weighting criterion (weighted average, column 7, lines 35-64).

8-6. Regarding claim 7, Shiraishi further discloses the plurality of different models includes three or more models (more of the previously measured baseline measurement values, column 7, lines 28-40).

8-7. Regarding claim 8, Shiraishi further discloses the plurality of different models includes three or more models (more of the previously measured baseline measurement values, column 7, lines 28-40).

8-8. Regarding claim 9, Shiraishi discloses a process for controlling projection electron lithography, comprising:

emitting a beam of electrons (projection exposure apparatus, FIG. 1);

producing measurement information on said emitting step (measuring a baseline data, column 3, lines 33-37);

producing predictive information related to the projection electron lithography process (baseline data measured previously, column 3, lines 37-41), and

controlling placement of the beam of electrons based on the predictive information and the measurement information (aligning the projected image, column 3, lines 37-45).

8-9. Regarding claim 10, Shiraishi further discloses said controlling step is implemented as a Kalman filter using least-squares based linear matrix algebra (Kalman filter, column 8, lines 4-11).

8-10. Regarding claim 11, Shiraishi further discloses said controlling step compensates for heating and beam drift effects (the effects of this change can be minimized, column 7, lines 55-64).

8-11. Regarding claim 13, Shiraishi further discloses the predictive information is produced by a plurality of different models, wherein said controlling step iteratively selects one of the plurality of different models until a best one of plurality of different models emerges (one, two, or more of the previously measured baseline measurement values, column 7, lines 28-40).

8-12. Regarding claim 14, Shiraishi further discloses the predictive information is produced by a plurality of different models, wherein said controlling step has a tunable strength parameter to determine an optimal adaptation weighting criterion (weighted average, column 7, lines 35-64).

8-13. Regarding claims 15 and 16, Shiraishi further discloses the plurality of different models includes three or more models (more of the previously measured baseline measurement values, column 7, lines 28-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi, U.S. Patent 6,243,158 issued June 5, 2001, and filed August 4, 1997, in view of Felker et al., U.S. Patent 6,177,218 issued January 23, 2001, and filed March 15, 1999.

10-1. Regarding claim 4, Shiraishi discloses a projection electron lithography system. However, Shiraishi fails to expressly disclose said system is a SCALPEL system.

Felker et al. disclose, "In recent years, lithographic processes in which a charged particle beam is used to delineate a pattern in an energy sensitive resist material have been developed. Such processes provide high resolution and high throughput. One such process is the SCALPEL® (scattering with angular limitation projection electron beam lithography) process" (Felker, column 1, lines 37-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Shiraishi to incorporate the teachings of Felker et al. to

obtain the invention as specified in claim 4 because the SCALPEL® process provides high resolution and high throughput (Felker, column 1, lines 39-42).

10-2. Regarding claim 12, Shiraishi discloses a process for controlling projection electron lithography. However, Shiraishi fails to expressly disclose said process is a SCALPEL process.

Felker et al. disclose, "In recent years, lithographic processes in which a charged particle beam is used to delineate a pattern in an energy sensitive resist material have been developed. Such processes provide high resolution and high throughput. One such process is the SCALPEL® (scattering with angular limitation projection electron beam lithography) process" (Felker, column 1, lines 37-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Shiraishi to incorporate the teachings of Felker et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12 because the SCALPEL® process provides high resolution and high throughput (Felker, column 1, lines 39-42).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Reference to Chen, U.S. Patent 5,719,796 issued February 17, 1998, is cited as disclosing a feedback system for analyzing and monitoring a manufacturing process.

Reference to Shah et al., U.S. Patent 6,285,971 B1 issued September 4, 2001, and filed August 10, 1999, is cited as disclosing a method using extended Kalman filtering type techniques for state estimation and system control.

Reference to Jabbari et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0120656 A1, published August 29, 2002, and filed December 19, 2000, is cited as disclosing a method using the filtered outputs to estimate the position of the wafer stage.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Herng-der Day whose telephone number is (571) 272-3777. The Examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 17:30.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere can be reached on (571) 272-3780. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Herng-der Day H.D.
November 1, 2004

JEAN R. HOMERE
PRIMARY EXAMINER